

CAREER LADDER / TIERED LICENSURE**April 30, 2014****Joint School District #2****Meeting Notes**

PRESENT: Rod Lewis, Chair; Linda Clark, Co-Chair, Senator John Goedde (via teleconference); Representative Marc Gibbs, Representative Wendy Horman, Representative Lance Clow, Superintendent Tom Luna (via teleconference); Geoffrey Thomas, Karen Echeverria, Wayne Freedman, Rod Grammer, Christina Linder, Brian Smith, Blas Telleria (for Rob Winslow).

NOT PRESENT: Senator Janie Ward-Engelking, Penni Cyr, Zach Wesley, Paula Conley

ADDITIONAL ATTENDEES: Taylor Raney, Paul Headlee, Tracie Bent

NEXT MEETING DATES: May 13, 2014 and May 27, 2014 at Joint School District #2

TENTATIVE AGENDA: May 13, 2014

- Updated presentation from Jason Hancock/Paul Headlee re Career Ladder structure
- Detailed presentation from SDE TAC re Tier 1 recommendations
- Preliminary presentation from SDE TAC re Tier 2
- Legal questions re tiered licensure

SYNOPSIS:

Linda Clark discussed the appropriate use and appointment of proxies. She discussed information received and conversations with Peter Winograd from New Mexico concerning the tiered licensure program that had been instituted. While Mr. Winograd did provide some questions for the group to consider, he would not offer anything further until Idaho develops a plan.

The Committee discussed elements of Tiers 1 and 2, including whether or not licensure was a property right; how existing teachers join the system; and how out-of-state teacher candidates would fit within the system. Paul Headlee presented a preliminary draft of the Career Ladder reimbursement plan, however, it did not contain the most recent figures.

Christina Linder gave a presentation on the NTEP work concerning pre-service requirements for new teacher licensure and their recommendation that new teacher requirements be expanded to include basic skills on all 22 benchmarks on the Danielson framework, an individualized professional improvement plan, and evidence of student achievement during their student teaching phase, in addition to the credit requirements and passage of Praxis II which currently are the only requirements for a teaching credential.

The Committee, Christina Linder (representing NTEP) and members of the SDE TAC committee were unclear concerning their roles and responsibilities and the overlap between the SDE TAC and this committee. Additional information was requested from TAC on the Tier 1 recommendations and the subjects that were considered in making those recommendations. Additional meeting dates were chosen and a tentative agenda was set for May 13, 2014.

Co-Chair, Linda Clark called the meeting to order and introductions were made. Ms. Clark reminded the Committee about the proxy process: while it was agreed that proxies would be allowed if a member were unable to attend, any proxy chosen must represent the same group as the absent member, i.e., a superintendent must be replaced by a superintendent, a teacher by a teacher, etc. Proxies may participate in the discussions of the day, but do not have the authority to vote on any issue.

Linda Clark discussed information received and conversations with Peter Winograd from New Mexico concerning the tiered licensure program that had been instituted. While Mr. Winograd did provide some questions for the group to consider (attached), he would not offer anything further until Idaho develops a plan. Anecdotal information received from New Mexico superintendents indicated that they did not have enough differentiation in their tiers and did not feel that they had enough focus on student achievement. In other words, they had higher salaries but no better outcome. Ms. Clark commented that they did not have the strong ties to student achievement that Idaho has.

Representative Clow voiced his understanding from the previous Governor's Task Force (Task Force) committees that they are something that you can move up and down – when you get your basic, you can do these things, 2nd tier you can do these things, 3rd tier you can do this, or, he asked, is it like personal property. Ms. Clark replied that when the Task Force looked at Tier 1 and a person is unsatisfactory, the committee was uncomfortable with loss of the license. In essence, there are other processes in place in all districts.

Teachers go through a series of improvement plans, but not loss of licensure. The Task Force did talk in great detail, and did talk about requirements to keep the Master Tier, that that performance evaluations and “exceeds expectations” were a part of that. It was apparent that the issue was complex, so the committee crafted their recommendations in very broad terms: three tiers of pay and three of licensure.

Rod Grammer asked if it was legal to take away a license when you come out of college and the initial license is a novice or provisional license for a certain amount of time.

Ms. Clark replied that it was provisional and stated that the Idaho Education Association (IEA) had differentiated between loss of job in a school district because of nonperformance. Tracie Bent added that due process was an important part of any termination.

Senator Wendy Horman suggested that the committee have a school employment attorney come to a meeting so that the committee is clear if it is creating a property right as opposed to a privilege.

Linda Clark agreed and also suggested that the statutes and administrative rules affected be identified. She stated that all were in agreement that loss of a job is difference from loss of license.

Geoffrey Thomas remarked that often when a teacher starts out, sometime during the first five years they just need more time, the right grade level, a different district in order to flourish. He agreed that the committee must be careful with legal issues.

Linda Clark said that the Meridian Human Resources Director had said that this is a 5-year process. But sometimes an outstanding teacher in the 7th grade may need to move to the 5th grade due to enrollment changes and then has two mediocre years. Is cutting off \$10K in salary appropriate? She also voiced some concerns about the appeal process -- some situations are not grieveable; the intent of the appeal process is for a personal situation and ranking.

Linda Clark said that she had talked with Rod Lewis about the role of this committee and the State Department of Education Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and agreed that this committee would not be asking all the same questions. The issue remains whether this committee accepts the TAC recommendations. Should the TAC committee continue?

Representative Gibbs asked for clarification on how existing teachers join the new system. He understood that new teachers would enter at Tier 1. Linda Clark explained that the

Task Force concept and recommendation was that in Year 1 of the new Career Ladder, all current teachers would be placed on Tier 2. No current teachers would come on at Tier 1, regardless of number of years they had been teaching. Under the current system, new teachers have a standard teaching certificate. That cannot be taken away.

Wayne Freedman commented that teachers who have already taught would be assumed to have enough experience to be grandfathered into Tier 2. Districts with mentors would continue to help them develop. All teachers are currently on a 5-year certificate renewal cycle, so that as they renew, they can apply for Tier 3, but will need to meet the requirements of Tier 3.

Blas Telleria noted that for a teacher in Tier 2, the funding is \$40K. However under the current model, it takes five years to get to the full \$40K.

Linda Clark and Brian Smith clarified that everyone would get a slight increase. Each person would be placed on the same level with their new increase, but ghost cells need to be created on the left for those who have a professional license but are being reimbursed at a lower level of funding. The ghost cells would ensure that until they faded out, lower level teachers would not be entering Tier 2 at \$40K.

Linda Clark introduced Paul Headlee, Deputy Division Manager, Budget & Policy Analysis Division, Idaho Legislative Services Office (LSO), to explain the Career Ladder funding further.

Mr. Headlee said that for FY 2015, public (and charter) schools received 46.8% of the General Fund appropriation, which is 1.3% lower than the previous 22 year average. Translated into billions, that is \$38 million. Over a 22 year period, the percentage of appropriation to education has decreased. In the mid 1980s, the percentage was 52%, but over time, increases to health and welfare and adult and juvenile corrections have resulted in the decrease to education. All other agencies have remained relatively the same.

In the 1950, single salary schedules were common in school districts. In order to address gender equity, state funding based on weighted average daily attendance and state average cost per student was introduced the 1960 and 1970s. In the 1980s, funding to districts was based on support units and state average cost. No statewide salary schedule existed prior to the 1990s.

In the 1993 a "Select Committee on Thoroughness" (task force) was formed in response to lawsuits and turmoil in Idaho, and held meetings across the state. The result was Senate Bill 1560 (1994 Session) which created a new funding formula using a statewide salary

grid, base salaries, and staff allowances. Instructors' base salary was set at \$19,328 which was determined by taking 82% of the national average instructor salary (\$35,000) and dividing it by the statewide index (\$28,700/1.4949 index - \$19,328). This is the current funding formula in use today. The current base salary for FY 2015 was set at \$23,354, so since 1994 to now, the based has increased 21% over 21 years. The salary has not kept up with inflation, and base salary is part of the funding formula.

The recession of FY 2010 and FY 2011 resulted in freezing the grid in order to meet budget reductions. Students Come First and Propositions 1, 2 and 3 resulted in the Governor's Task Force for Improving Education, which is where we are today.

In the statutory requirements of K-12 funding, salary based apportionment is the largest at 67%, with instructors comprising 50% of that amount. Non-statutory distributions and, finally, discretionary funding make up the rest. Mr. Headlee reviewed the current salary multiplier table ("the Grid") which determines a teacher's index based on experience and education, and the resulting single salary schedule.

In building a new model, the Fiscal Stability Committee of the Governor's Task Force zeroed in on key elements:

- Easy to understand
- Stability
- Provides accountability
- Fully-funded
- Considers rural Idaho
- Equitable
- Adequate and competitive
- Flexibility
- Focus on achievement
- Equalized

Mr. Headlee outlined the Proposed Career Ladder Salary Table, which includes a 6-year phase-in. The estimated cost is \$26M in year 1, and \$42M annually (cumulatively) in years 2-6. An additional \$850 per teacher leadership premium was funded by the 2014 Legislature, which reduces the first year implementation to \$26M.

Mr. Headlee acknowledged that this chart was a work in progress and did not show the ghost cells. Mr. Headlee's complete presentation is attached.

Ms. Clark asked Mr. Headlee to have the update by the next meeting, as there has been concern expressed over new people suddenly making more than teachers who have been stuck on the grid for years, which is the reason for the ghost cells.

Representative Gibbs noted that the six year phase in numbers, \$42M each year, cumulative, and \$250M annually to fully implement, is a significant commitment. Representative Horman noted that when all current teachers are placed in Tier 2, they are on the path to \$51,000 per year. The only teachers in Tier 1 are new teachers.

Linda Clark reminded the committee that this is not a state salary schedule, it is a reimbursement for what the state will pay. Districts have the option to pay more. What is actually paid varies from district to district. Some smaller districts pay from the grid.

Representatives Gibbs asked for a breakdown of what teachers are making now. Karen Echeverria may have that information; Jason Hancock may have that information. Representative Wendy Horman asked how many teachers are currently on Schedule 1, 2 and 3 contracts. Senator Goedde asked for two numbers: (1) how many teachers would be in Tier 2 at adoption; and (2) how much those people would be paid under the Career Ladder model. Linda Clark will ensure that these questions included in Jason Hancock's new numbers.

Brian Smith asked if the \$42M also was based on movement and increases in the base. Linda Clark asked about the FTE growth factor, moving to a Master Level.

Linda Clark asked the committee if everyone understood that the career ladder would mirror tiered licensure. Representative Clow said that he understood, but was not necessarily comfortable with it.

Mr. Headlee said that budget requests are due to LSO by September 2. The Budget Coalition Meeting at the State Department of Education is in mid-August. This committee has time to make adjustments.

Right now for FY 2014, state revenues are tracking at \$14.7M ahead of forecast for the first nine months, which is not that much when the total forecast is \$3 billion. April is the largest month. If the forecast is met for the remaining three months, \$10M would be deposited into PESF at the end of FY 2014, and \$40M would be carried over to start FY 2015.

The FY 2015 adjusted revenue forecast is 6.1% above FY 2014, which essentially is a "forecast on a forecast." No forecasts will be made for FY 2016 until January 15, 2015.

Finally, Mr. Headlee said that a 5% appropriation increase for FY 2016 would be \$69M. Some uses could include \$26M for Career Ladder, \$15M for Enrollment Growth, Bond Levy, etc; \$28M to restore discretionary funds. That scenario would not include increases for technology, professional development, salaries for administrators and classified staff, backfill of discretionary funds, PERSI increase or new line items. The \$69M could be used quickly, and Mr. Headlee suggested the committee might consider increasing the budget request to get some stability in the state system as a whole.

Linda Clark next introduced Taylor Raney, Director, Certification and Professional Standards, State Department of Education, and Christina Linder, Associate Dean, Idaho State University to discuss tiered licensure and the Network for Transforming Educator Preparation (NTEP). NTEP is a grant that Idaho applied for and received prior to the Task Force because of its work in the areas of teacher preparation and early discussions of tiered licensure.

Christina Linder explained that the purpose of NTEP is to develop teacher preparation programs that ensure that teachers are prepared on day one to model and develop skills and knowledge which students need to succeed. Idaho does not want parents to be concerned that their child has a new teacher; rather, it wants parents to be confident and excited that their child will be exposed to a competent teacher on day one. The NTEP steering committee members are:

- Tracie Bent, State Board of Education
- Penni Cyr, Idaho Education Association
- Paula Kellerer, Northwest Nazarene University
- Christina Linder, Idaho State University
- Taylor Raney, Department of Education
- Randy Schrader, Garden Valley School District

The TAC committee members, studying tiered licensure, are:

- Andy Grover, Superintendent, Melba School District
- Barb Leeds, Human Resources Director, Joint School District No. 2
- Becky Meyer, Principal, Lake Pend Oreille School District
- Lisa Burtenshaw, Trustee, Idaho Falls School District #91
- Mikke Nuckols, Teacher, Bonneville School District #93
- Shawn Tiegs, Teacher, Nez Perce School District
- Paula Kellerer, Dean, Private Universities
- Christina Linder, Associate Dean, Public Universities
- Penni Cyr, President, Idaho Education Association
- Rod Gramer, President, Idaho Business for Education

- Roger Borwn, Office of the Governor
- Tracie Bent, Office of the State Board of Education

Currently, pre-service requirements for initial certification for teachers are:

- Minimum credit requirements
- Content test (Praxis II)

The proposed pre-service requirements for initial certification for teachers are:

- Minimum credit requirements
- Content Test (Praxis II)
- Assessment for effective teaching on Danielson Framework¹
- Individualized Professional Learning Plan (IPLP) using data
- Measureable student achievement

Ms. Linder explained that the additional requirements are designed to demonstrate that certificate candidates have measureable abilities, a plan to demonstrate how they will grow and improve, and measureable student achievement. Geoffrey Thomas asked how a pre-service teacher can be measured on student achievement. Ms. Linder replied that they would be measured during their semester of student teaching.

Ms. Linder said that under the current system, with only minimum credit requirements and a Praxis II test, new teachers are granted a standard 5-year teaching certificate. Under the proposed additional requirements (Tier 1), new teachers would be granted a 3-6 year interim, non-renewable license to teach. It is not a full license, not a property right, and not a fully-renewable right. It is hoped that at the end of three years, Tier 1 teachers would be able to demonstrate the requirements (on Danielson) to reach Professional Teacher status (Tier 2), which would be a 5-year license. If not, those Tier 1 teachers would be reviewed every year and new IPLP plans put in place.

Linda Clark referenced back to the New Mexico questions concerning a teacher in Tier 1 for six years. “Are we going to allow a teacher for 6 years not meeting the requirements, knowing the damage they can do?” She said that from a school district perspective, by the end of 3 years, the district would have completed due process and probation, and would not allow a teacher to continue who was not making progress toward proficiency.

¹ The Danielson Framework for Teaching is a research-based set of components of instruction, aligned to the INTASC standards, and grounded in a constructivist view of learning and teaching. The complex activity of teaching is divided into 22 components (and 76 smaller elements) clustered into four domains of teaching responsibility: Domain 1: Planning and Preparation; Domain 2: Classroom Environment; Domain 3: Instruction; and Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities.

Blas Telleria said that he would like to hear what laws would need to be changed to implement a 3-year interim license. Linda Clark said such a list is part of the committee's charge.

Christina Linder said that scores on Danielson Framework and its 22 components would be based on evidence, and rated by a state-approved evaluator trained in the Danielson Framework. Right now, all Idaho public and private universities are in agreement with these new standards for teacher certification. They are rooted in research by the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) 2013 study – a partnership with 3,000 teachers and lead researchers.

The IPLP would be based on the scores from the Danielson Framework and would show a person's plan for improvement, with specific, measureable, time-bound goals. Brian Smith asked if there would be goals set for all 22 elements. Ms. Linder replied that the specifics still need to be fleshed out, but she would anticipate that a teacher candidate would choose no more than three total, one each from the three critical domains: Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, and Instruction. The candidate would probably identify the areas themselves with support and agreement with the university and supervising teacher.

Blas Telleria asked who would conduct the evaluations. Ms. Linder replied that a university supervisor would have the responsibility to make a recommendation for certification. Linda Clark asked if everyone who supervises is certified in the Danielson Framework.

Blas Telleria voiced concern that only Domains 2 and 3 are observable, Domains 1 and 4 are inconsistent, and a teacher has no ability to control Domain 4. Ms. Linder replied that some new teachers will not be able to do what an in-service teacher can do; exceptions will occur. Mr. Telleria also asked what if a supervising teacher disagrees with a university recommendation. Ms. Linder responded that discrepancies would likely have come up earlier. "It is never going to be perfect; we are piloting and ready to go."

As a committee, the practitioners are welcome for their practical considerations to implementation, and she invited them to submit their questions. Along with the questions, it would be helpful to have possible solutions.

Representative Clow said that his daughter is in school out-of-state. If she intends to come back, but her out-of-state school is not following Idaho's plan, he asked where she would fit

in. Ms. Linder replied that if Idaho adopts this model, she would receive a 3-year interim license.

Geoffrey Thomas thanked Ms. Linder for the coordination and communication of this program, but noted that NTEP has had two years whereas the committee has had two hours. He felt it would take a lot of communication and understanding before the committee would be ready to adopt this plan. He voiced concern that there be a rush to implementation. Implementation needs to be thorough and methodical. He does not disagree with the plan, but feels that assimilation is a 7-9 year process.

Ms. Linder replied that the university understands that, and asks that the committee re-thinks and go forward; they are moving forward; they are not satisfied with the current level of preparation.

Mr. Thomas said that the problem is not the quality of new teachers, but that there are not enough of them. He does not want to come from a mindset that Idaho's system is terribly flawed. The problem in his mind has been that students don't pursue teaching as a career.

Representative Horman asked if the universities intend to move forward with their plan regardless of what this committee does. She asked about their time frame. Ms. Linder replied that they hope to move to this program next year, and will look at candidate recommendations on a case by case basis.

Tracie Bent stated teacher preparation requirements are within administrative rules. The committee might consider if there are pieces of the NTEP program that the committee might want to require later on. Does the committee want to take pieces of their recommendations into administrative rule?

Tom Luna said that the NTEP work started long before the original Task Force. NTEP presented to the Task Force, and the Task Force chose to adopt their work. A "2" or "basic" rating on the Danielson is not really a high bar. It is a fair, but not unreasonable bar. Linda Clark said that "basic" was very basic. She could not see a parent being excited about a basic teacher. She would hope that most candidates score as a "3" and proficient. She thought it would be helpful for a school to have a new teacher's scores.

Representative Horman asked if considerations were given to raising the standards for educator requirements. Ms. Linder responded yes, but that was more a question of admission to the program, and NTEP was looking at the exit from it.

Representative Clow said that when Idaho is successful at raising compensation for education, we will see more students and we will get the best and the brightest.

Taylor Raney referred the committee to the handout, "Targeting Growth: Using Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) as a Measure of Educator Effectiveness, published by the Reform Support Network. In this model, a teacher would obtain data on the class, define a subgroup by the greatest need, choose a goal, write an objective and see some measureable difference from the pre-test to the post-test. Many states have adopted this model, and Idaho is considering it. Many quality programs exist, and NTEP is identifying and evaluating them to improve practice. The goal is to identify greatness and replicate it.

Linda Clark asked if, during the 4 years in teacher preparation, students take a class in the Danielson model before they are evaluated based on it. Ms. Linder replied that from the very first course, the program is aligned to the framework; there is an overview of it and a seminar covering it. The courses are fully aligned. There are no surprises.

Chairman Lewis asked how implementation of the tiers would affect teacher preparation. Ms. Linder replied that the NTEP committee believes it will be positive. Early in their work, teacher candidates were unsure what they wanted. With a good wage and professional levels, she believes it will speak to their professional excitement. Teaching is complex and amazing. When Idaho can show that there are professional tiers, it will be amazing to our state.

Linda Clark summarized the Tier 1 recommendation:

- Minimum credit requirements
- Content Test (Praxis II)
- Assessment for effective teaching on Danielson Framework
- Individualized Professional Learning Plan (IPLP) using data
- Measureable student achievement

The IPLP is the plan for the first year of teaching developed during the student teaching phase.

Brian Smith asked about teachers coming in from other states who already have five or more years of teaching experience. Ms. Linder replied that this committee would need to decide and look at their number of years teaching experience. They could be put on an initial license and they would have three years of practice to go to Tier 2 to stay there and then apply to Tier 3. Mr. Smith noted that if they were on the career ladder, they would be paid significantly less which could be a barrier to recruiting out-of-state teachers. It would

seem reasonable to put them on an interim license, and move to a professional license within one year of demonstrated ability. Linda Clark agreed that she could not hire a seasoned out of state teacher on Tier 1.

Rod Grammer cautioned not to confuse tier with salary. He suggested a provisional license but that teacher would need to meet performance standards. Superintendent Luna said that Career Ladder is a funding mechanism how districts will be funded for teachers; it does not tie the hands of the district for how teachers are compensated. Linda Clark responded that the purpose of Career Ladder and Tiered Licensure is to bring fiscal stability to the school districts. She did not want to be tied to a \$50K salary if she was only being reimbursed \$40K from the state.

Superintendent Luna suggested that Leadership Premiums could be used to attract and retain teachers, using the hard to fill provision. Linda Clark replied that using hard to fill was a swamp full of alligators, and she would have nightmares. Why was the position hard to fill? Districts must be very careful.

Rod Grammer noted that Massachusetts has a tier of Preliminary for non-traditional teachers, like teach for America, or a mathematician, and they still could get higher pay. He would like to see a preliminary tier so he could act on someone with a non-traditional path. Blas Telleria countered that there are rules or there are not. Christina Linder replied that Idaho acknowledges professionals from other states. If you are a professional in another state, you should probably be one here.

Linda Clark said that she assumed the committee did not want to approve pieces, but approve an entire package.

Representative Clow asked how out-of-state teachers would be compensated – they could qualify for a Master license. They could apply at that level and if they qualify, fine. Linda Clark replied that the only way the rollout works is if no one is placed on a Master level to start. Otherwise, the state could have a flood of applicants. The model only works to move to Master level for whoever would naturally re-certify. It was the only way to provide the Legislature with the costs. Representative Clow reasoned that an out-of-state teacher could fall in Tier 2 but not have Tier 2 compensation. Brian Smith reminded him that reimbursement from the state will be the same or higher as a teacher's present reimbursement level; no one would get less. Superintendent Luna agreed: no one will get less, and the districts will not get less, but Jason Hancock needed to explain this. Linda Clark advised that Mr. Hancock will present at the next meeting.

Linda Clark, Rod Lewis, Brain Smith and Rod Grammer voiced thoughts on provisional status for out-of-state teachers coming into the system and how to convert their experience. Just as ghost slots could be used so that beginning teachers are not making more than those who have been stuck on the present grid for a while, a preliminary tier also applies a ghost slot. Superintendent Luna agreed. He said that one of the purposes for the ghost slot is to assure that those who make more than in Tier 2, but who will be on Tier 2, will not be paid less. A provisional license would allow a district to observe the out-of-state teacher while s/he proves himself. Linda Clark wanted to ensure that any system that is created will not bankrupt small districts. She felt it was important to know how much the state will pay on a tier because some districts can only pay what the state reimburses.

Linda Clark asked the committee if it was comfortable with the recommendations for Tier 1 for new teachers straight from college. Representative Horman felt that many questions still were unanswered; Rod Lewis agreed and felt the committee needed more detail.

Tom Luna said that the TAC committee is made up of practitioners focused on research around the country on how to develop a licensure program. They avoided some of the questions of this committee because they are the questions of implementation: the consequences and the financial impact. The Career Ladder/Tiered Licensure committee is made up of decision makers and policy makers. TAC did not look at those kinds of questions.

Representative Gibbs said that in thinking about funding, the FY 2015 budget is based on a 6.1% growth; he is cautious to pass something and then have a holdback. He said that he likes the concept but is cautiously optimistic about funding, and thought that the Joint Finance-Appropriations Committee (JFAC) could pose a struggle. Linda Clark replied that a lot of discussion over funding had taken place on the original Task Force, but the price to children and teachers was so important. Their focus was on what it would take to reach the 60% Goal, and the biggest factor in fiscal stability of the education system was teacher compensation. The Task Force was sensitive to the fact that it carried a big price tag. Representative Gibbs said that student achievement needed to be part of it. Linda Clark said that members of the Task Force also had emphasized accountability – they did not want to pay people simply for being a year older. They felt that Tier 3 was not an entitlement; a teacher must sustain the qualifications in order to stay in Tier 3, and it was tied to student achievement and accountability.

Superintendent Luna said that the challenge will be to make the changes go forward, but we must do our education system differently. How that is accomplished will be determined by the willingness of people to make those changes.

Rod Grammer suggested that the committee needed to get the tiers right; then they could work with the fiscal aspect. The TAC committee is working on building in accountability and student achievement, about students growing and improving academically. One aspect of Tier 2 is student achievement. The fiscal aspect will be determined by the realities of the State.

Blas Telleria said that felt that districts need teachers 5-7 days before school starts. The teachers receive data on their students before school starts and they need time to assess those students and develop plans. Those days cost money. Linda Clark replied that teachers were already coming in early. Representative Horman said that some anticipation existed that higher pay would mean more contract days. Linda Clark said she would like to add more contract days for professional development, committees and pre-school planning.

Rod Lewis asked about how to get from the Tier 1 recommendations to rule, and asked for more detail on how Tier 1 was developed. Representative Horman voiced concern that the recommendations may have been made without legal or fiscal consideration, and Superintendent Luna confirmed that TAC had not considered the legal or fiscal aspects. They looked at the recommendations of the Task Force, who had already agreed to NTEP's recommendation for teacher preparation. They did not re-debate the Task Force. Rod Lewis agreed that a guiding principal this year is not to revisit Task Force principles, but to get to rules. But before writing rules, he wanted to hear more detail on Tier 1 so the committee can comfortably approve it.

The committee then discussed how to work with the TAC committee. Rod Lewis felt that this committee has the responsibility to approve the detail, and that the TAC committee has the practitioners to flesh out that detail. He requested a more rigorous presentation so that this committee could ask questions and challenge back. Linda Clark agreed that his committee has been tasked with the responsibility, but TAC is doing the work. She also wanted a more detailed presentation, as well as a legal person at the next meeting, and Jason Hancock to introduce Career Ladder. Christina Linder said that she sat on all three committees, and felt that limited clarity existed on the roles of each. Rod Lewis said that TAC was to develop its recommendations and bring them to this committee, including the issues that it had grappled with. He stated that one of the guiding principles was not to get into labor issues, but the committee also needs to understand where those issues intersect.

Linda Clark said that neither NTEP nor TAC have any approval authority; this committee is charged with approving the final submission to the State Board; the practitioners should flesh out the underlying issues because they are in the best position to think them through.

Superintendent Luna said that TAC will give a more robust presentation at the next meeting, including the issues and debate, in order for this committee to have more comfort in facing the fiscal and legal side and what rule might look like.

Linda Clark raised the issue of time, and Superintendent Luna said that TAC will adjust its time from a 3-week schedule to a 2-week schedule. Rod Lewis asked for preliminary recommendations on Tier 2 at the next meeting in 2 weeks. He also reminded the committee about the process of the legislature and funding: there is a certain cadence of the legislature. Superintendent Luna agreed. He said that the financial momentum is a parallel process. If this committee has no rules for the legislature to consider, then it risks losing this unique opportunity.

Representative Clow reintroduced the question of how to deal with poor performing teachers. Linda Clark stated that a mechanism is already in place, and if districts are honest with each other, and if districts ask for the information, all history is required to follow a teacher. Districts have always had the ability to fire teachers, and now administrators have the responsibility to share complete information. She also felt that the committee does need to talk about license expiration. Licenses expire now. The ease to renew should be there, but teachers should not be rehired if they are not proficient.

Blas Telleria said that the Boise District sheds its poor performing teachers in year two, and that they undertake a rigorous hiring process for teachers. Brian Smith said that there are times when people don't fit well in one environment but would flourish elsewhere and felt there was a big risk in not renewing a license. Representative Gibbs said that a poor teacher could not get hired if they don't have a license. Christina Linder said that TAC had discussed this extensively. Linda Clark suggested reinstituting the mentoring program to help new teachers. The State has not had it recently because of funding, although the Leadership program has helped. She believes that mentoring changes the perspective of someone who is not doing well. Representative Gibbs said, "Let me be blunt: if you are looking for another \$250M for teachers, you have to help us get rid of the bad ones." Linda Clark said that no one wants to have bad teachers.

Representative Clow did not believe a teacher should have an extended license at Tier 1. Wayne Freedman explained that the concept was that new teachers would have 3 years to have demonstrated development of their craft and granted professional status; if not, there

would be measures to help them become successful, like a probation, and then another year, but at the end of 4 years if not significant evaluation was proved, then there would be a real sit down conversation and question if this is the right profession. It does not speak to district hiring, it speaks to license. Linda Clark said that if they were not proficient, their license would not be reissued.

Blas Telleria said that the Boise District was done with a poor teacher at the end of year 2. Wayne Freedman said that it is addressed differently at the district level than the licensure level by the state. Linda Clark said that it was about growth and due process systems; the third element is documentation to terminate. It has operated separately for licensure, and is a different paradigm if tying to licensure, a massive change. That would be a system to ensure that a person did not teach.

The committee briefly mentioned Leadership awards, but agreed to wait until the next meeting when Jason Hancock would be present.